



Gerd
Stern

Support of Television Arts by Public Funding:

Public funding of the arts is a relatively new and still controversial phenomenon in the United States, where the free enterprise model has been accepted as a traditional social ideal for cultural as well as commercial endeavors. During the depression years of the 1930s the WPA programs provided jobs for artists practicing their skills for the public benefit in much the same way as did the programs for construction trades. Since those days there has been ever-increasing speculation concerning the role of the public sector in financing cultural enterprise.

There is in fact a strong historical case to be made against public expenditures on the arts in the United States. It is, after all, a European invention of questionable roots in the corrupt court life of Europe—hardly a suitable precedent for a democracy in the later half of the 20th century. Another American case against public subsidy for the arts is—and this is our Puritan ethic showing through—that the arts are fundamentally frivolous and those who want them should be prepared to pay for them.

The argument against this position comes from those of us who feel that the same logic could well be applied to attack education, health care, or even public street lighting. One of the essential functions of democratic government is to spread the cost of essential services. Many people, though by no means all, and certainly not a majority, consider that the arts are not just a frippery of life, but one of its vital parts.¹

The New York State Council on the Arts

The "leisure society" with its postwar appetite for recreational activities recognized and appreciated this vitality of the arts, producing a population explosion of its own among practitioners and audience. These enthusiasts in turn encouraged and educated new generations of aspiring professionals, amateurs, and a geometrically increased audience for all cultural activities.

As educators and teachers sought expression for their own and their pupils' energies in creative arts curricula for primary, secondary, higher education, and adult programs, this organic process of democratization initiated public expenditures. The outcomes of these and other aspects of recent social change as they relate to the arts are beyond our present subject. Some of the political implications of such broad-based social dynamism from the Swedish perspective are discussed in the previously cited book by Roland Palsson, who closes his "Cultural Policy For An Open Society" with these observations.

In closed, authoritative societies and in states with great political instability, the collaboration between art and politics can most easily be read in the form of repression of artists and intellectuals. This may be physical repression or a subtle technique of social isolation. In open societies where a dynamic cultural policy has become a possibility, this same collaboration can be read in the flexibility and development of the cultural institutions, including both reforms of traditional ones and the introduction of new areas of activity as they open up as new alternatives.²

In our society there has been an ongoing conflict, in all fields of endeavor, between the demands of excellence and those of equity; the needs of institutions and the rights of individuals; and the subsidy of established forms as against the support of innovative activity. The resolution of such appositions comes particularly hard to administrators protecting public interests in areas of experimentation with new technologies. In the context of West Germany, Hermann Glaser writes,

The state and social authorities who support the arts should continuously make room for what is new; not because anything new is certain to be better, but because it stimulates one to think again, to think further—to meditate. In this sense, the trustees of culture open the door to the present and future, but don't for that reason deny the demands of tradition. Nevertheless, in the interests of the necessary socio-political flexibility and dynamics a certain, even large part of a state

subsidy, must serve up to date needs. A German proverb says: "Let many flowers bloom!" This must be reflected in the program of all cultural organizations; above all openings must be continually made so that pluralist taste can be discussed in a pluralistic fashion.³

One such "opening" was the establishment of the New York State Council on the Arts (NYSCA), an agency of the State's Executive Department operating with funds appropriated by the Legislature. As Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller wrote about the Council in 1970:

Ten years ago, when I proposed to the State Legislature that a New York arts council be established, few of us foresaw the significance of legislative creation of the nation's first government agency for support of the arts. The Legislature can take pride in the fact that all the other states in the union . . . and even the federal government have followed New York's lead.⁴

The State Council on the Arts was created as a temporary commission in 1960 and became a permanent agency in 1965, the same year which saw the establishment of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Council on the Arts by the United States Congress. The growth of the New York State Council's activities can be judged from its budget, which grew from a study grant of \$50,000 in 1960-1961 to staff and program budgets of \$450,000 in 1961-1962, \$1,504,477 in 1966-1967, \$20,208,570 in 1970-1971, and some \$34,000,000 in 1974-1975.

The concern for pluralism was evident in a statement by the Council's first Executive Director, John B. Hightower:

. . . Public money requires that an arts organization perform a service for the public. This incontrovertible measure of who gets how much and for what forces arts organizations to think purely and simply in terms of human beings.⁵

And again from Governor Rockefeller:

. . . In New York State more than 75 million attendances were reported at art events in 1970-1971. That attendance figure, more than four times the State's total population, even dwarfs the number of cars that entered the New York State Thruway in the same time period.⁶

As for letting flowers bloom, Eric Larrabee, the Council's next Executive Director, put it this way in a recent interview:

The Council had always maintained a very open attitude toward new art forms and a willingness to experiment, to take chances, to recognize the difficulties of arriving at tight value judgments in new situations where the standards were still nascent, embryonic. . . .⁷

To my mind, it was this open attitude on the part of the Council toward the embryonic art form embodied in the consciousness of television technology that fostered the creation of substantial activity and a body of varied work in the video medium. I don't mean to say that the Council was alone in making this investment. Private foundations, among them the JDR 3rd Fund, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, the Markle Foundation, and publicly, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and various state art councils, funded projects in arts and television. However, the number and diversity of projects funded by the New York State Council is without parallel.

The late sixties was in any case a crossing of many conceptual and technological lines and relationships for television. Color came into wide use, satellite transmission was a fact, the overt political power of the medium which had been conclusively demonstrated in the presidential debates of 1960 was more widely understood and contested, and Japanese consumer equipment came on the market, making it possible for some members of the public to become personally acquainted with the use of television cameras and recording equipment.

Television is defined on the most abstract level as an electromagnetic wave transmission and reception system for sight and sound; but for more than thirty years television's image was cast in the commercial broadcast industry mold pioneered by radio. In the early fifties legislation reserved broadcast channels for educational television, and in the mid-sixties public funds were appropriated through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to help expand extant educational television facilities and to help establish new stations. It was not till the late sixties, after the Carnegie Commission report, that federal funding for program production was authorized and channeled through the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the Public Broadcasting System. This was a considerable

shift in position for many legislators who had feared government funding could create government control violating the constitutional guarantees of free speech.

The Carnegie Report also was responsible for the shift in terminology from "educational" to "public" television. As Paul Kaufman of the National Center for Experiments in Television wrote in "Reflections on Values in Public Television,"

The impact (of public television) is caused by a change in consciousness resulting from the fact that, for the first time, Americans can see the broadcast experience in a full moral and political context. This consciousness began to evolve as soon as the word "public" with all its ancient symbolic meaning was linked to television. . . . The brief declarations for "freedom," "imagination" and "initiative" written by Congress into the public broadcast law are explosive far beyond what could have been intended. . . . "Imagination" suggests the original act of conceiving new images and ideas. "Freedom," the political condition in which this imagination may flourish. "Initiative" declares a faith in the self-generated search as the appropriate beginning steps toward a community of values.⁸

In like cause artists had used the tube. Nam June Paik, who has been referred to as the George Washington of the video arts movement, began to work with modulated and warped television images in the early sixties. Eric Siegel, one of the few artists to combine technical and aesthetic skills, won prizes at the New York City Science Fair for his homemade closed-circuit TV in 1959 at the age of 15 and the next year for "Color through Black and White TV." The author, with a group of collaborators, used a mix of eight closed-circuit and broadcast images as part of "Who R U? and What's Happening?" at the San Francisco Museum of Art in 1963. The National Center for Experiments in Television at San Francisco's KQED was initially funded by the Rockefeller Foundation in 1967. Early television art works were created by, among others, Aldo and Elsa Tambellini, Jackie Cassen, Robert Whitman, Stan Vanderbeek, and Ken Dewey—one of the most eloquent proponents and practitioners of the combined use of human performers and technology. Dewey, as Program Development Director for NYSCA in the late sixties, had a great deal to do with the Council's early enthusiasm for the video medium.

In October of 1965, Paik, with grant money from the JDR 3rd Fund, bought one of the first available ½-inch Portapacks, videotaped around New York City, and showed the tapes that same evening at the Cafe Au Go Go. His pronunciamiento on that occasion included the phrase, "... the cathode ray tube will replace the canvas." Another early instance of portable video use comes up in Jud Yalkut's interview of Frank Gillette:

I got into it (videotape) when Fordham University—Marshall McLuhan's Media Center . . . laid some equipment on me . . . for three months to do whatever I wanted. . . . I had been doing monochromist minimal painting, dealing with concrete concepts. . . . Along came the contact with Fordham, and I first produced a five and a half hour documentary on St. Mark's Place. I spent three weeks standing on Gem's Spa corner interviewing the locals. The documentary's conception was that it focused from the inside out—these people defining themselves, and not my going in and extracting information of which they're only an element. . . . Then I experimented through the Village Project with the effects of videotape on kids with bad trips . . . let them use the cameras on me, themselves, as a means of expression as opposed to a means of recording their expression. . . . I also used videotape like a canvas, specifically about four hours of what I call a self-portrait on videotape, that used four cameras with two feedback systems. There are points in the self-portrait where you see on tape me looking at myself on tape, looking at myself on tape. . . .⁹

Paul Ryan, who was associated with the Fordham project (initiated by John Culkin, who now heads the Center for Understanding Media), wrote concerning three of his earlier videotape works:

Generally the introduction of new technologies has taken little account of the way in which the existing culture is already programmed. . . . Confession, the college classroom, even a six gun shoot out (referring to the three works) are extremely contrived forms. What's important is that electrical information systems such as videotape introduce an elasticity into the creation of new cultural forms that may free us significantly from the parameters of contrivance we've had to date.¹⁰

Ryan was also the first consultant employed by NYSCA to survey the burgeoning numbers of video makers and to recommend funding strategies toward an assistance program in TV/media for 1970-1971. Earlier, in 1967, the Council had commissioned "A Report on Intermedia," by John Brockman and Gerd Stern, which surveyed media artists and their work and

made recommendations leading to "Intermedia '68," a New York State tour by eleven artists' groups, sponsored by the State Council with the help of National Council funds; of these artists at least five, Ken Dewey, Les Levine, Nam June Paik, Aldo Tambellini, and USCO, had used television in their work.

In 1969-1970 the Council supported Tambellini's experiments with television as a creative medium. He worked with students and teachers in schools within the broadcast areas of the State's five noncommercial television stations, bringing children into the studio environment to produce videotapes. That same year Jackie Cassen received a grant which enabled her to work with Channel 13 in New York City toward the establishment of an Artist's Television Workshop. This was a pilot investment on the part of the Council and the Rockefeller Foundation, and with some difficulties in the beginning blossomed within a few years to become the Television Laboratory at WNET 13.

The formation of a Council program in TV/media was an extremely sensitive task. There were first of all the public/educational stations and other institutions with investments in the application of the new technology. There were a rapidly increasing number of alternative media groupings jockeying for position and many unaffiliated individual artists. Lines were drawn between those developing techniques of working with synthesis and abstract images and the advocates of video as a revolutionary communications tool. Much of this ferment became visible during the Alternate Media Conference at Goddard College in Vermont, which included participants and observers from all portions of the media spectrum, including the Council.

Talking about that period recently, John Hightower observed:

We had been concerned with the artistic uses of television and had very little interest in the approach of televising concerts or artists at work. Video was a new instrument of artistic expression; the syntax wasn't yet clear or refined. How could one say that one person was more articulate or more effectively expressive? The fact was that a contemporary electronic palette was being used and it really wasn't up to the State Arts Council to make curatorial judgments of what was good or bad,

particularly since the syntax was so undeveloped. The best thing was to make the permissive and inclusive gamble of funding a lot of experimentation by virtue of the fact that it was experimentation. That was a pretty early part of the Council's philosophy and concern: to always be more inclusive, than exclusive, and accepting of experimentation and the freedom to fail. . . .¹¹

Granting at the Council by that time had evolved into an interaction among staff members who evaluate requests and proposals and make recommendations to panels, which are constituted of practitioners, critics, and administrators in the various program areas such as visual arts and performing arts, and, in the last area, film, TV/media, and literature. Panel deliberations result in funding recommendations presented by the staff to a Council subcommittee and by the Chairman of that group to the Council as a whole. The fifteen Council members are appointed by the Governor to five-year terms and serve without pay.

It was a period of flux for the NYSCA organization, with a budget jump from somewhat over two million dollars in 1960-1970 to over twenty million dollars in 1970-1971. John Hightower had left his post as Executive Director and become a member of the Council. Council member Eric Larrabee was in turn to become Executive Director. As Peter Bradley, Program Director for Film, TV/Media, and Literature, wrote in the Council's Annual Report:

The dramatic expansion of Council support of film, television and literary projects—the dollar amount has increased from \$65,000 in 1969-70 to \$1.5 million in 1970-71—is making it possible to reach audiences in numbers undreamed of in previous years. Since, unlike other forms of artistic expression, film, TV programs, videotapes and published writing have a continuing life of their own, the ultimate number of spectators and participants benefiting from State support in this record budget year is incalculable.¹²

Very soon after Paul Ryan's report on the state of the video movement had been submitted to Peter Bradley, the Council brought Russell Connor to its staff as Program Associate in TV/Media. With a background in painting, Connor had been involved in the production of a public television series for the Boston Museum of Fine Arts and had assembled "Vision and Television," the most comprehensive show of video art to


date, for Brandeis University's Rose Art Museum. In an interview he said:

In the summer of 1970 you could identify people making video who were quite unashamed to describe themselves as artists and those who were embarrassed at the thought. The reason they were applying to the Arts Council is because the Council had indicated an interest. Most of the groups at that time were stressing the social importance of video, changing the way people deal with each other, breaking down the whole television structure. I came from the concern for television defining itself as a medium for art . . . most of us had a general discouragement with the inaccessibility of television for the artist.¹³

There were four major video groups operating in New York City at the time: Raindance, Global Village, People's Video Theatre, and Videofreex, each of them with somewhat similar but divergent identities and survival strategies. A number of the people involved in Raindance had proposed to the Council an ambitious equipment and skills pool, to be called "Video Annex" or, in later stages, "The Center For Decentralized Television." Under the auspices of the Jewish Museum, which during the directorship of Karl Katz was one of the more innovative arts institutions in the city, the proposal included a Video Gallery for exhibition of finished works, community showings, services to city neighborhoods and upstate communities, a computer program for hardware and software distribution, and newsletters and other publications. It was at first well received, but interpersonal problems and paranoia in the video community legislated against this unified approach and the proposals were separated and scaled down, group by group.

The four groups just mentioned were among the Council's grant recipients in 1970-1971, and each has been influential in its own way. For instance, Raindance was funded for the compilation and maintenance of a videotape archive and the publication of a video newsletter, Radical Software. It is ironic that probably the single most influential element in spreading the video word was not a tape but a printed periodical. The makeup of the first few issues was extremely nontraditional and highly communicative. The publication was full of news running the gamut from conceptual insights to the cataloguing of names and addresses of interested groups and individuals, available tapes, materials and equipment, maintenance and

service hints; and throughout it displayed much high energy. A small sample of early messages: from Radical Software, summer 1970:

Videotape can be to television what writing is to language. . . . Fortunately new tools suggest new uses, especially to those who are dissatisfied with the uses to which old tools are being put. . . . Television is not merely a better way to transmit the old culture, but an element in the foundation of a new one. Only by treating technology as ecology can we cure the split between ourselves and our extensions. . . . We eagerly solicit information and information about information which readers feel we should include. Anything from practical and experimental video to comments on the current pollution of the information environment. . . . To encourage dissemination of the information in Radical Software we have created our own symbol of an x within a circle: . This is a Xerox mark, the antithesis of copyright, which means Do copy."¹⁴

Like many of the groups, People's Video Theater did not have official nonprofit status, which is a must for all NYSCA assistance. Their funds were channeled through the so-called "umbrella" of the American Crafts Council. The theater itself was in a downtown loft. As Ken Marsh wrote at that time:

People's Video Theatre is conceived as a means for exposure of community people's ideas, goods and services to be supported by those using it. Toward the development of video journalism, PVT serves to explore more responsive handling of information in working with groups and covering their needs. . . . The people are the information; media processes can reach out to their needs. Procedures for helping a group define and refine its statement, whether an initial or response statement, involves utilizing the video system.¹⁵

Marsh's development in video since that time is interesting and not atypical of the move away from the city by many of the video enthusiasts. Committed to intervention in the city scene at that time, he now heads Woodstock Community Video, one of the pioneering successes in getting alternate material on the cable. Woodstock, New York, traditionally an artists' colony, has been receptive to the experiment, and Marsh reflected recently:

The whole idea of community based theatre was that the people who generate the information and the audience are one and the same. But in the city that didn't turn out to be true even in our own neighborhood. We did a video questionnaire for shoppers and shopkeepers about all kinds of things like prices and garbage on the streets and shoplifting and then we showed it on the street and taped some more and invited people up to the loft, but the audience at the loft, just around the

corner, would wind up being from Queens and New Jersey. . . . The situation up here in Woodstock lends itself to that kind of communication. . . . I went through the art education of the sixties at Cooper, but I definitely never saw myself as part of that gallery scene. What an artist in a sense is looking for is some identity and with media I felt I could achieve that by helping others to find theirs through the use of media. . . .¹⁶

For the individual artist, without any institutional association, public funding had been an impossibility. In 1970-1971, and each year since, the Council funded the Cultural Council Foundation to provide financial assistance through the Creative Artists Public Service Program to both new and established artists working in fields including choreography, music composition, poetry, prose, drama, film, video, painting, sculpture, photography, graphics, and multimedia. Announcements of the CAPS awards are made throughout the State and applications are available. These are evaluated by the CAPS staff; the artists' work is assembled and reviewed by a panel of peers. Awards usually range from \$1,000 to \$5,000, and the artists are paid to participate in public service activities of benefit to State residents such as readings, lectures, demonstrations, exhibitions, performances, residencies, workshops, and donations of finished work. In 1970-1971, out of 123 grants there were 7 in video; in 1971-1972, out of 89 grants there were 7 in video; and in 1972-1973, out of 86 grants there were 10 in video. The position of the NYSCA TV/media program toward public and educational television has been that there is only one justification for support; the use of television as an artistic medium. Supporting any educational use or the recording of events would risk the possibility of duplicating funding from the State Department of Education. The TV/media program has encouraged the stations of the New York Network to explore television as an electronic art form and to bring in artists of various disciplines to work with the medium.

In 1970-1971 six stations were funded for a variety of cultural program productions, and WNET-13 was funded to develop the Artist's Television Workshop and to enable artists' access to experiment with videotape. In 1971-1972 again six stations were funded, this time for the production of *Carousel*, a thirteen-week arts series sponsored by the Council, WNET-13 for the Workshop newly named the Television Laboratory. In 1972-1973 there were seven station grants for artists-in-

residence periods at the stations and to the Television Laboratory for continued operation, development of a synthesizer, and access to artists.

The support of Channel 13's Television Laboratory is an outstanding example of a combination of public Council and private foundation funding. The Rockefeller Foundation has supported arts and cultural program developments in public television since the early sixties. Norman Lloyd, Boyd Compton, and Howard Klein of Rockefeller's Arts Program have been responsible for three major projects. At WGBH, Boston, an experimental workshop on television program concepts and production techniques for cultural programming allowed producers such as Fred Barzyk to work with a number of creative artists and humanists. It was in this shop that the first video synthesizer, the Paik-Abe, was developed. At KQED in San Francisco a second experimental workshop became the National Center for Experiments in Television, headed by Brice Howard and Paul Kaufman, working with a group of artists and technicians. The third, New York's WNET TV Lab under the direction of David Loxton, commands the largest potential number of viewers, since New Yorkers seem to watch public broadcasting in greater percentages as well as numbers. Major works such as Ed Emshwiller's "Scapemates," and Nam June Paik's "Global Groove," have been produced and the Artist Access Program has made the Lab's facilities available for 80 days out of the year to video arts experimenters. As far as access goes, Ed Emshwiller has speculated that more viewers may see one television broadcast of his work than have seen his well-known experimental films through all the years of underground and educational showings. This access to large audiences provided by broadcast television is of obvious interest to those who expend public funds. The promise of cable, with its multi-channel potential for satisfying pluralistic tastes, appeals to many innovative communicators. The Council's TV/media assistance programs in 1970-1971 include no mention of cable. In 1971-1972 eight programs were directly related to cable and public access television, in workshops, production, or, as in the case of the New School for Social Research/Global Village programs, in a feasibility study concerning neighborhood facilities for the production of live programming for cable television. Thea Sklover, probably the most

outspoken public access advocate in the country and director of Open Channel, received assistance in support of a community cable facility in New York. As Russell Connor wrote of the year 1972-1973:

There is a continuing search for wider video distribution. New York City's public access cable channels remain an important facility, and a three-day Public Access Celebration supported by the Council during the past year drew attention to the opportunity that the public had to create programming for its own needs. Elsewhere throughout the State, Council-supported groups have been able to arrange with local cable stations for regular transmissions of documentary and artistic tapes.¹⁷

That same year saw Connor leaving his Council staff position for the lure of the cable as an arts medium. As Director of Cable Arts Foundation he has been responsible for the production of a series of two-hour programs on arts themes such as "Music: City Sound," "Painting and Sculpture: Of Time and the Artist," "Jazz Meets Video," "Dance: New Spaces." These programs have been shown on a week-long same-time basis as A for Arts on the New York City municipal cable channel and will, one hopes, be seen on other cable outlets. They are a model for "bicycling" programs from outlet to outlet. The critics of cable point to the small percentage of urban home connections to these systems, but as rural subscribers mount year by year, other services are provided via cable, and these channels are programmed with such automated playback devices as cassettes, the artist's input may find an outlet to significant and specific audiences. The experiments in programming by Cable Arts, Raindance Foundation, Woodstock Community Video, Media Bus with its tie-in to the cable from a mobile playback facility, and other Council programs are well-considered investments in the future.

The TV/media program, following a model which pioneered in film, has provided video recording and editing equipment in a pool available to artists from MERC, or Media Equipment Resource Center in New York City. Workshops for various skill levels in video production techniques have been funded in different areas of the state. Exhibitions of video art works have been supported at a number of museums. The most ambitious of these is the Everson Museum traveling video invitational show, "Circuit," assembled by video curator David Ross.

Production facilities for artists, notably the Experimental Television Center at Binghamton operated by Ralph Hocking, have also been funded. Since 1971-1972 the Council has helped in the support of the Kitchen, a video showcase founded by Woody and Steina Vasulka. Independent artists out of a European tradition, the Vasulkas inspired a new generation of video makers by their own free-wheeling examples of image manipulation using home-built switchers, keyers, colorizers, and assorted gear to attain their creative objectives. Through their appreciation of other artists' work, they assured the visibility of new work soon after it appeared.

These workshop and laboratory experiments are not altogether ivory tower experiences limited to the avant-garde. Many of the techniques and developments pioneered in studio situations are applicable and have been applied to the transformation of performing and visual arts experiences into the language of broadcast television. The early notion of video as a recording format has been replaced by the artist-producer's understanding that the transformation and hybridization of media must be effected and guided by an aesthetic true to the medium. Even the extremist spokespeople for alternate media are more interested in broadcast and cable exposure in these early seventies than in the late sixties. The realization that today's art is not tomorrow's but today's television is comprehensible to anyone who is exposed daily to the tube.

Video art is perhaps the clearest demonstration of the effect of new tools on working techniques. Only a few years ago the video artist's tool of choice was the ½-inch Portapak, with its funky immediacy of feedback. Groups such as the Downtown Community Television Center and many others assisted by the Council are still furthering the development and sophistication of portable techniques. The latest assistance programs provide for the purchase of time-base correctors by a number of the State's public television stations, which will facilitate the broadcasting of material produced on ½-inch and other non-broadcast-standard video formats. Moreover, there is a definite shift apparent in the character of the Council requests for TV/media assistance. More artists are involved in the direct generation of images by electronic means. If the camera is used at all it is used as an element in an electronic feedback loop. One of

the factors holding back this segment of video art has been the high cost of color equipment. Even though most of the signals are generated in black and white and colorized only in the last stages of composition, the recording and playback equipment must be color, and if any mix of virtual images is used, color cameras and lighting facilities are necessary. Productions of such work with abstract and graphic forms in rhythmic color, which a few years ago was a museum and gallery novelty, have now been broadcast widely, as in the case of WGBH's video synthesist Ron Hays accompanying a performance of the Boston Symphony.

The need for new, expensive technology has changed the balance of assistance to some extent from the support of individual artists working together with minimal equipment to the funding of regional workshops and laboratories which can provide and maintain facilities on a shared basis for a succession of artists.

When one looks at the present state of television art, the number of artists and producers and administrators of facilities and institutions, established, emerging, and already vestigial in this new art form, the influence, overt and immanent, of the New York State Council funding program is apparent. In trying to relate the issues of public funding of a new art form with the program of the Council, I have skimmed, overlooked, and done without much transitional material in the attempt to provide a collage of fact and opinion which accurately represents the process of the last few years. Probably the best discursive and informational source on the larger process of art and technology is Douglas Davis's book Art and the Future. He speaks of

... a generation raised on television rather than print, indeed, on a medium of communication that is sensory and evanescent rather than iconic and static, able to focus easily on multiple monitors and screens. . . . Art is information. The "system" we know as art in this culture is there because we need it. The need may be subconscious, and the information available through art highly esoteric, but the phenomenon is biologically necessary. . . .¹⁸

This theorem takes us back to W. Howard Adams's notion of democratic government as providing essential services and the

vital part which the arts play in life. The public support of new art forms reflects a societal shift away from stockpiling a product, whether that be gold at Fort Knox, or paintings and sculpture at the National Gallery, toward responsible investment in human recreation.

Note: Because of restrictions on space, it has been necessary to omit an appendix listing details and amounts of NYSCA grants to television for 1971-1972, 1972-1973, and 1973-1974. This information can be obtained by writing Annual Reports, New York State Council on the Arts, 250 West 57th Street, New York, New York 10019.

Notes

1. W. Howard Adams, "Public Aid for the Arts—A Change of Heart," in Cultural Policy and Arts Administration, ed. Stephen A. Greyser (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Summer School Institute in Arts Administration, 1973), p. 2.
2. Roland Palsson, "Cultural Policy for an Open Society," *ibid.*, p. 30.
3. Hermann Glaser, "On the Philosophy of Arts Administration," *ibid.*, pp. 38-39.
4. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor's Foreword, New York State Council on the Arts, Annual Report, 1969-1970, p. 6.
5. John B. Hightower, Executive Director's Statement, *ibid.*, p. 114.
6. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor's Foreword, New York State Council on the Arts, Annual Report, 1971-1972, p. 5.
7. Gerd Stern, taped interview with Eric Larrabee, Executive Director of the New York State Council on the Arts, December 1973.
8. Paul Kaufman, "Reflections on Values in Public Television," National Center for Experiments in Television, 1972, pp. 3-4.
9. Jud Yalkut, interview with Frank Gillette and Ira Schneider, Radical Software, Summer 1970, p. 9. Reprinted from the East Village Other, July 30, 1969.
10. Paul Ryan, "Three Pieces: Some Explication," East Village Other, April 11, 1970, p. 13.
11. Gerd Stern, taped interview with John B. Hightower, Director of the Associated Councils of the Arts, December 1973.
12. Peter Bradley, New York State Council on the Arts, Annual Report, 1970-1971, p. 15.
13. Gerd Stern, taped interview with Russell Connor, Director of Cable Arts Foundation, December 1973.
14. Selections from masthead page, Radical Software, Summer 1973.
15. Ken Marsh, "Alternatives for Alternative Media: People's Video Theater Handbook," Radical Software, Summer 1970, p. 18.
16. Gerd Stern, taped interview with Ken Marsh, Director, Woodstock Community Video, December 1973.
17. Russell Connor, Program Associate, TV/Media, New York State Council on the Arts, Annual Report, 1972-1973.
18. Douglas Davis, Art and the Future (New York: Praeger, 1973), pp. 168, 170.

THE NEW TELEVISION:

ESSAYS, STATEMENTS, AND
VIDEOTAPES BY VITO ACCONCI,
JOHN BALDESSARI, GREGORY
BATTCKCK, STEPHEN BECK,
WOLFGANG BECKER, RENE BER-
GER, RUSSELL CONNOR, DOUG-
LAS DAVIS, ED ENSHWILLER,
HANS MAGNUS ENZENSBERGER,
VILEM FLUSSER, HOLLIS FRAMP-
TON, FRANK GILLETTE, JORGE
GLUSBERG, WULF HERZOGENRATH,
JOAN JONAS, ALLAN KAPROW,

A PUBLIC/PRIVATE ART

DAVID KATZIVE, HOWARD KLEIN,
SHIGEKO KUBOTA, BRUCE KURTZ,
JANE LIVINGSTON, BARBARA LONDON,
EDWARD LUCIE-SMITH, TOSHIO MAT-
SUMOTO, JOHN MCHALE, GERALD
O'GRADY, NAM JUNE PAIK, ROBERT
PINCUS-WITTEN, DAVID ROSS,
PIERRE SCHAEFFER, RICHARD SERRA,
ALLISON SIMMONS, GERD STERN,
PAUL TITELMAN, HAROLD SZEDMAN,
STAN VANDERBEEK, EVELYN WEISS.

THIS BOOK IS EDITED BY DOUGLAS
DAVIS AND ALLISON SIMMONS AND
BASED ON 'OPEN CIRCUITS: AN
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
THE FUTURE OF TELEVISION,'
ORGANIZED BY FRED BARZYK, D.
DAVIS, GERALD O'GRADY, AND
WILLARD VAN DYKE FOR
THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART
NEW YORK CITY.

THE NEW
TELEVISION:
A
PUBLIC/PRIVATE
ART